United Nations A/54/914–S/2000/564

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.: General
12 June 2000

Original: English

General Assembly
Fifty-fourth session
Agenda item 43
The situation in the Middle East

Security Council
Fifty-fifth year

Letter dated 12 June 2000 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to enclose herewith a letter, addressed to you by the President of the Republic of Lebanon, Émile Lahoud, which I kindly request to be circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda item 43, and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Selim **Tadmoury**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

00-47633 (E) 130600 130600

Annex to the letter dated 12 June 2000 from the Permanent Representative of Lebanon to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

[Original: Arabic]

Letter dated 9 June 2000 from the President of Lebanon addressed to the Secretary-General

I should like to convey to you my particular gratitude for the efforts that you, personally, are making to assist Lebanon and in the endeavour for the implementation of Security Council resolution 425 (1978) and the verification of Israel's withdrawal to the international boundaries. I should also like to thank you for the pains taken by the United Nations team headed by your Special Envoy, Mr. Terje Roed-Larsen.

As you are preparing to submit to the Security Council a report on the conclusions you have reached, I should like to draw your attention to the points set forth below, which are of exceptional importance to us as they relate to those conclusions and the consequences they may have.

I. Security Council resolution 425 (1978)

In this resolution the Security Council "calls for strict respect for the territorial integrity, sovereignty and political independence of Lebanon within its internationally recognized boundaries" and "calls upon Israel ... to ... withdraw forthwith its forces from all Lebanese territory".

II. Report of the Secretary-General of 22 May 2000 (S/2000/460)

Paragraph 11 of this report states that "for the practical purpose of confirming the Israeli withdrawal, the United Nations needs to identify a line to be adopted conforming to the internationally recognized boundaries of Lebanon ..." and that "the United Nations will then identify physically, on the ground, those portions of the line necessary or relevant to confirming the withdrawal of Israeli forces".

Paragraph 13 of the report states that "the international boundary between Israel and Lebanon was established pursuant to the 1923 Agreement between France and Great Britain ...", that "this line was reaffirmed in the Israeli-Lebanese General Armistice Agreement signed on 23 March 1949" and that "subsequently there were several modifications mutually agreed by Israel and Lebanon".

III. The thrust of the resolution, the above report and the work of Mr. Roed-Larsen and his team

The resolution and the report, as well as the historical records and the various documents and maps, including those in the possession of the United Nations, confirm unequivocally that there are between Lebanon and Israel "internationally recognized boundaries" that have never been in dispute between the two countries. Indeed, the descriptive delimitation of these boundaries completed in 1923 was meticulously retraced in 1949, under the supervision of the United Nations and its observers, from boundary pillar 1 to boundary pillar 38 by way of all those in between.

Lebanon was therefore astonished, during the meetings held with the United Nations representatives, by statements intimating that its boundaries with Israel were not precisely confirmed, that Israel had not submitted any documents or maps, and that the United Nations had lost the 1949 armistice delimitation documents in a flood. Lebanon, for its part, submitted the 1923 and 1949 documents and all the approved maps of the boundaries in question, of whose accuracy and authenticity there can be no doubt, while no one has come forward with any evidence to refute the maps, documents, agreements and records indicated.

Lebanon was also surprised by the proposal to adopt a "withdrawal line" for the purpose of confirming Israel's withdrawal when resolution 425 (1978) and the report of the Secretary-General make no mention whatever of any such line but refer to "a line ... conforming to the international boundaries". Accordingly, the withdrawal can only be confirmed on the basis of the boundary line and not on the basis of a fanciful and non-existent "withdrawal line".

Lebanon was further surprised to be told that it was not the task of the United Nations to delimit the boundaries between Lebanon and Israel. It responded by stating clearly that it was not, of course, the task of the United Nations to delimit the boundaries between Lebanon and Israel just as, at the same time, it was not the task of the United Nations team to ignore existing, recognized boundaries and to replace them with an imaginary "withdrawal line" to be used as a basis for confirming Israel's withdrawal in breach of the letter and spirit of the resolution and the report. Besides, Israel had itself recognized, in article 1 of the Lebanon-Israel agreement of 17 May [1983] (subsequently denounced) that the two parties agreed to respect each other's sovereignty, political independence and territorial integrity and that they regarded the existing international boundaries between Lebanon and Israel as inviolable. (The text of the agreement was shown to Mr. Roed-Larsen at the time.)

There is an existing international boundary that is not in doubt and that is established in the records and by history, and it can obviously be used to confirm whether or not the withdrawal has taken place.

In connection with the Shab'a farmlands, it is clear from the report of the Secretary-General that a de facto line has been adopted for the area in light of the fact that there are no old maps that can confirm the boundary there between Lebanon and Syria. Accordingly, the de facto line is the line separating the areas of operation of UNIFIL and UNDOF, while the United Nations notes that this line can in no way be regarded as affecting the rights of the parties concerned with respect to their international boundaries.

Lebanon has accepted this assessment until such time as a joint formula for the farmlands area can be agreed by Lebanon and Syria for submission to the United Nations. Inasmuch as there is no such ambiguity with respect to the boundary between Lebanon and Syria north of the farmlands, Israel's withdrawal from the Lebanese highlands on Mount Hermon is a matter that pertains to the implementation of Security Council resolution 425 (1978), which uses the expression "from all Lebanese territory".

The concept of a "de facto line" is used in the Secretary-General's report only with reference to the status of the Shab'a farmlands. Lebanon was astonished by the attempt to apply the same concept to the Lebanon-Israel boundaries, which is totally incompatible with the Secretary-General's report and Security Council resolution 425 (1978). Where there are "internationally recognized boundaries" there can be no

"de facto line". Indeed, the Secretary-General adopted such a line only where there was ambiguity in the case of the boundaries of the Shab'a farmlands.

IV. Cooperation with the United Nations in the drafting of a non-paper

The Lebanese side spent more than one week with Mr. Roed-Larsen and his team in drawing up a draft non-paper. The extensive discussions conducted for this purpose led to a preliminary understanding pending confirmation of Israel's withdrawal. Lebanon was therefore surprised by the press release of 6 June 2000 giving an account of the results of the work of the United Nations team, some aspects of which conflicted with the agreed text in the non-paper. The most important point is that it cast doubt on the existing international boundaries between Lebanon and Israel and again adopted the principle of the "withdrawal line" rather than the "boundary line" in breach of Security Council resolution 425 (1978) and the report of the Secretary-General. It thus left a dangerous ambiguity with regard to the distance and the amount of territory separating the international boundary line and the imaginary "withdrawal line". This means that the withdrawal line will provide protection for continued Israeli violations of the international boundary line located beyond it. We wish, in this connection, to draw attention to the need to remedy this situation.

With Mr. Roed-Larsen and his team Lebanon also raised the issue of the Lebanese detainees and hostages held in Israeli prisons and the question of the repatriation of the remains of resistance fighters. Lebanon called for the immediate release of the prisoners and hostages on the grounds that the situation in which the arrests took place and the two remaining hostages, Sheikh Abd al-Karim Obeid and Hajj Mustafa al-Dirani, were abducted arose during the time of Israel's occupation and should therefore lapse when its withdrawal takes place.

Lebanon further raised the issue of the diversion of water from Lebanese territory and its belief that the dismantling of all Israeli equipment and installations used for this purpose is a step that must necessarily accompany the withdrawal. It also requested the United Nations to investigate the question of the depletion of the Hasbani river in the vicinity of the international boundary.

In conclusion, Lebanon, which always cooperates with the United Nations and earnestly seeks the implementation of the letter and spirit of Security Council resolution 425 (1978) and of your report, wishes to draw your attention to the observations set out above in the light of their importance and gravity. Lebanon also draws your attention to the difficulties it is encountering in its work with the UNIFIL team assigned to verify the withdrawal on the ground. The line in question, also, despite our previously stated objection to it, has been the scene of Israeli violations at numerous points and has been imprecisely determined because of the pressure brought to bear on the United Nations team to expedite its work to the detriment of accuracy. We fear that this too may further complicate matters.

Lastly, I take this opportunity to thank you once again for all the efforts you are making and to express appreciation for those also being made by your Special Envoy, his team and the United Nations troops operating in Lebanon. I hope that these efforts and endeavours will meet with all the success we can wish them.

(*Signed*) Émile **Lahoud**
General
President of the Republic

United Nations S/2000/565

Security Council

Distr.: General
12 June 2000
English
Original: French

Letter dated 12 June 2000 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council

Further to my letter dated 12 January 2000 (S/2000/18) regarding the approval of the distribution plan submitted by the Government of Iraq for phase VII of the humanitarian programme pursuant to Security Council resolution 986 (1995) of 14 April 1995, I have the honour to inform you that the Government of Iraq was informed today that I have approved the proposals made by the Government for the inclusion of a housing sector as part IX of the distribution plans for phases VI and VII. The Government of Iraq has also been informed that the requirements for housing have been approved on the understanding that the implementation of this part of the plan would be governed by resolutions 986 (1995), 1281 (1999) and 1284 (1999) and by the Memorandum of Understanding concluded on 20 May 1996 between the United Nations Secretariat and the Government of Iraq (S/1996/356), and would be without prejudice to the procedures followed by the Security Council Committee established by resolution 661 (1990) of 2 August 1990. The letter dated 12 June 2000 addressed to the Permanent Representative of Iraq to the United Nations from the Executive Director of the Iraq Programme is attached.

A copy of the list of supplies and goods contained in the distribution plans concerned will be made available to the Security Council Committee. The list has been scrutinized by experts of the United Nations Monitoring, Verification and Inspection Commission, who concluded that, on the basis of the limited information given in the annexes, no prohibited items could be identified. They will keep the matter under review and provide a further assessment in the light of any additional information that may become available.

(*Signed*) Kofi A. **Annan**

00-47588 (E) 120600 120600

Annex

[Original: English]

Letter dated 12 June 2000 from the Executive Director of the Office of the Iraq Programme addressed to the Permanent Representative of Iraq to the United Nations

With reference to your letter dated 6 June 2000 and previous letters dated 3, 10 and 22 May 2000 concerning allocations to the housing sector under phase VI and phase VII of the humanitarian programme pursuant to Security Council resolution 986 (1995) of 14 April 1995, I should like to recall that in my letter of 12 January 2000, I informed you that the Secretary-General would await the outcome of the joint technical review before taking a decision on the proposals made by the Government of Iraq regarding the housing sector. I have now been authorized by the Secretary-General to convey the following.

Having examined the findings of the joint technical review, submitted to your Government under cover of my letter dated 12 April 2000, and having received the agreement of your Government conveyed in your letter dated 22 May 2000, the Secretary-General has concluded that the revised plan concerning housing requirements, if properly implemented, should assist in meeting essential civilian needs for housing. The housing sector requirement is therefore approved for the inclusion as part IX of the distribution plans for phase VI and VII, with the following understandings.

In regard to the budgetary allocations for phases VI and VII of the humanitarian programme, while this is endorsed for the purpose of planning, it may be necessary to adjust expenditures in the light of the final revenues generated during the respective phases.

The implementation of the plan for the housing sector is governed by Security Council resolution 986 (1995) and all other relevant resolutions, and the Memorandum of Understanding concluded on 20 May 1996 between the Secretariat of the United Nations and the Government of Iraq (S/1996/356). In case of inconsistency between the particular provisions of the revised plan on the one hand, and the relevant resolutions and the Memorandum of Understanding on the other, the provisions of the latter documents shall prevail.

The approval of the housing sector is without prejudice to actions that might be taken by the Security Council Committee established by resolution 661 (1990) regarding the applications for export of particular items contained in the list submitted for the Committee's consideration, in accordance with its procedures.

The housing sector is approved in accordance with the findings and conclusions of the joint technical review referred to above. I also note that, as explained in your letter dated 22 May 2000, additional requirements for housing will be submitted, as amendments, to the distribution plans for phase VI and phase VII, by the Ministry of Housing and Construction and the Ministry of Industry and Minerals. On receipt of the said amendments, these will be reviewed and incorporated, as appropriate, in the distribution plans concerned, within the framework for the equitable distribution of goods established by the joint technical review.

In his letter dated 12 June 2000 addressed to the President of the Security Council, the Secretary-General stated that, as part of his endorsement of the housing sector, United Nations observers will be deployed to Iraq to fulfil the observation requirements pursuant to Security Council resolution 986 (1995) and the Memorandum of Understanding of 1996. Accordingly, I have requested the United Nations Humanitarian Coordinator in Iraq, in conjunction with the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements (Habitat), to ensure that appropriate observation procedures are put in place immediately and to ensure that United Nations observers undertake observation of housing settlement supplies delivered and utilized under the relevant resolutions.

The Office of the Iraq Programme will assist in identifying item codes for all commodities that fall within the housing sector, as well as in amending the relevant distribution plans, as appropriate. Contracts circulated and approved to date against the original codes in annex I to the distribution plan for phase VII will be considered as funded against the allocation for the housing sector, thereby freeing resources for other items required for the food-handling subsector. In this context, I should like to note that the additional $100 million allocation for the food-handling subsector requested under cover of your letter, dated 10 May 2000, may now be assigned. However, should your Government wish to fund housing sector commodities from the additional $100 million allocation, as indicated in your letter dated 4 May 2000, this sum may be added to the new sectoral allocation.

I should like to assure you that the observations of the relevant Iraqi authorities conveyed to me in your letter dated 22 May 2000 are appreciated and will be dealt with at the technical level by my colleagues in Iraq.

(*Signed*) Benon V. **Sevan**
Executive Director

United Nations S/2000/566

Security Council

Distr.: General
12 June 2000

Original: English

Third report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo

I. Introduction

1. By paragraph 19 of its resolution 1291 (2000), the Security Council requested the Secretary-General to provide a report every 60 days on progress in the implementation of the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement and of that resolution. The present report, which has been prepared in accordance with that resolution, reflects developments since the Secretary-General's second report on the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC) (S/2000/330 and Corr.1 of 18 April 2000).

II. Political developments

2. On 30 April, the President of Algeria, Abdelaziz Bouteflika, as current Chairman of the Organization of African Unity, convened a summit in Algiers, on the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, with the participation of President Chissano, President Konaré, President Kabila, President Mbeki, President Obasanjo, and a representative of President Chiluba, as well as the neutral facilitator, Sir Ketumile Masire, and my Special Representative, Kamel Morjane. The objective of the meeting was to help move the peace process and the inter-Congolese dialogue to a new stage. Participants issued a statement in support of the Lusaka Agreement and the inter-Congolese dialogue. They encouraged the facilitator to pursue his mission and urgently appealed to the parties to fully cooperate with the ongoing efforts to organize and convene the dialogue. They also called for respect for the ceasefire and for the United Nations to move to the next phase of its mission in the region. South Africa and Nigeria expressed readiness to consider contributing military personnel to MONUC.

3. From 4 to 8 May 2000, a Security Council mission led by the Permanent Representative of the United States of America, Ambassador Richard Holbrooke, visited the Democratic Republic of the Congo and neighbouring countries pursuant to a letter dated 24 April 2000 from the President of the Security Council to the Secretary-General (S/2000/344), which also contained the mission's terms of reference. The report of the Security Council mission is contained in document S/2000/416 of 11 May 2000.

4. During their visit, the members of the Security Council mission met in Kinshasa with President Kabila and with representatives of Congolese civil society, religious groups and political parties. Three of the members (the Permanent Representatives of Namibia, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) visited Kananga, which had been identified as one of the four possible sites for the deployment of a MONUC battalion.

5. Immediately following their meeting with President Kabila, the members of the mission witnessed the signing of the status-of-forces agreement between MONUC and the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The agreement was signed by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Yerodia Abdoulaye Ndombasi, in the presence of President Kabila.

00-46864S (E) 130600

6. In their subsequent visits to Lusaka, Harare, Kigali and Kampala, the Security Council mission then met with President Chiluba, President Mugabe, President Kagame and President Museveni. In Lusaka, the mission met with the members of the Joint Military Commission, and then with the Political Committee. At that meeting, the Permanent Representative of France stated his intention, subject to the views of the Security Council as a whole, to invite the Political Committee to meet in New York during the French presidency, in the month of June. The meeting is scheduled for 15 and 16 June.

7. In their meetings with Presidents Kagame and Museveni on 7 and 8 May, the Security Council mission participated in intensive discussions with both Heads of State, which resulted in an agreement by Rwanda and Uganda to withdraw their forces from Kisangani following the clashes that had broken out between them early in May. However, the fighting later resumed and has since intensified (see paras. 11 to 13 below).

8. The Security Council mission also met with representatives of the Congolese Rally for Democracy (RCD) and RCD-ML (also known as RCD-Kisangani), at Kigali and Kampala respectively. (The movement known as RCD-Goma has now resumed its former name of RCD.) Another faction of this movement, known as RCD-National, has reportedly been formed by a former senior official in RCD-Goma, Rogers Lumbala Tshitenge. On 7 June, it was announced that two former members of RCD-ML had left the party to form a new group called the Congrès des progressistes pour la libération (CPL). The leader of the Movement for the Liberation of the Congo (MLC), Jean-Pierre Bemba, despite having received an invitation from the mission to meet with its members in Kampala, did not appear, citing logistical difficulties.

9. On 3 June, President Kabila and President Kagame met at Eldoret in Kenya under the auspices of President Moi. The meeting was apparently the culmination of a series of discreet contacts involving a number of African capitals. While it is not clear that any substantive agreement emerged from the meeting, it appears to have ended in a cordial atmosphere. The two Heads of State reportedly discussed the Interahamwe and the release of prisoners of war.

10. The Political Committee met again on 8 June in Lusaka to discuss, *inter alia*, the preparations for its meeting with the Security Council in New York on 15 and 16 June. Members also discussed the release of prisoners of war, the fighting in Kisangani and around Mbandaka, the inter-Congolese dialogue and the JMC's proposals for the implementation of the disengagement plan. These, however, were not approved.

11. During the period 9-12 June, as the present report was being completed, a series of violent demonstrations took place outside MONUC headquarters in Kinshasa. Several hundred demonstrators, apparently protesting against MONUC's supposed inaction during the fighting in Kisangani, threw stones at the headquarters building and the United Nations vehicles parked outside, smashing a number of windows. MONUC staff working in the building narrowly escaped injury from flying glass. Though local police stood by, the protests appeared to be coordinated by individuals in the crowd.

12. MONUC lodged a vigorous protest with the authorities, reminding them of their obligation to guarantee the safety and security of United Nations staff.

III. Military developments

Fighting in Kisangani

13. Persistent outbreaks of heavy fighting in the city of Kisangani, Orientale Province, have caused an estimated 150 civilian deaths and more than 1,000 casualties, as well as severe property damage. The belligerents concerned, the Rwandan Patriotic Army (RPA) and the Ugandan Peoples Defence Force (UPDF) have continued to fight in spite of repeated efforts that I and others have made to arrange a ceasefire.

14. On 8 June, together with the United States Permanent Representative, Ambassador Holbrooke, I contacted President Kagame and President Museveni to urge them to order an immediate cessation of hostilities and a withdrawal of their respective forces in accordance with the agreement they signed with MONUC on 21 May. Though they agreed to do so, and the fighting subsequently eased in intensity, the two armies later resumed combat.

15. The fighting in Kisangani has been particularly destructive, with both sides using artillery, mortars and automatic weapons. In addition to the civilian deaths

and injuries and to the death of many soldiers in combat, this has resulted in serious damage to the power station, the hydro-electric dam, the cathedral and at least one hospital in the city. Large numbers of dwellings, including those occupied by the MONUC military observers, have been destroyed or seriously damaged. Electricity and water supplies have been cut off, and outbreaks of cholera are feared as residents use river water for their needs.

16. Serious fighting initially erupted in Kisangani in early May between the UPDF and the RPA, causing heavy loss of life among Congolese civilians. Despite the agreement reached by the Presidents of Rwanda and Uganda and a written agreement, brokered by MONUC, to withdraw their forces and demilitarize the city, heavy fighting subsequently broke out again on 5 June, even as the two forces were in the process of pulling back from the city.

17. On 12 June, reports indicated that Ugandan forces had withdrawn northwards from Kisangani and a cessation of hostilities appeared to have been put in place. United Nations and other humanitarian agencies have made arrangements for a flight of urgent food and medical supplies to be delivered to Kisangani as soon as security conditions permit. This will require action to secure the airport and provide unloading and delivery services to the agencies who will then distribute the supplies. In order for this effort to succeed, a reliable ceasefire will have to be maintained.

Kisangani demilitarization agreement

18. On 21 May, pursuant to the statement released by the Presidents of Rwanda and Uganda on 8 May during the visit of the Security Council mission, the military commanders of the two sides at Kisangani signed an agreement with MONUC to demilitarize the city. In accordance with the agreement, Ugandan and Rwandan units began withdrawing from their positions on 29 May with a view to pulling back to positions 100 km away from the city. It was in the midst of these preparations that fighting broke out on 5 June.

19. The plan called for the deployment of MONUC military personnel to Kisangani, including its two airports, port and military camps. MONUC military observers were to monitor and verify the simultaneous withdrawal of the Ugandan and Rwandan armed forces to designated locations.

20. Following the agreement, MONUC increased its presence in Kisangani from one to four 4-man teams of military observers, four staff officers and two civilian officials, and initiated preparations to dispatch a battalion to Kisangani. Though these preparations are now in abeyance as a result of the continuing fighting in the city, four additional observers have been dispatched to Kisangani and more are on standby.

Fighting in Equateur Province

21. Despite substantial compliance in other parts of the country with the ceasefire agreement of 14 April, starting early in May elements of MLC began a major southward advance along the Ubangi River, which forms the border with the Republic of the Congo (Brazzaville). This advance had continued despite assurances given on 23 May to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General by the MLC leader that his troops would halt their forward movement. During that meeting, Mr. Bemba had informed the Special Representative that his forces had been acting in response to attacks on them by the Government, and that they could not withdraw without exposing the local people to retaliation.

22. On 25 May, government forces and their allies announced that they had attacked MLC to stem their advance. This clash represented a major violation of the ceasefire agreement, as well as a serious threat to Mbandaka, since the MLC advance to the confluence of the Ubangi and Congo rivers to the south of the city cut the riverine route linking it with the capital.

23. While the Government counter-attack has apparently succeeded in driving some of the MLC forces back towards their original lines, some MLC forces are still understood to be in a position to interdict the resupply of Mbandaka by river. On 5 June, the Government and their allies requested the MONUC observer team in Mbandaka to convey a message to the MLC Chairman threatening to push back MLC troops by force if they did not withdraw to the positions held at the time of the signing of the Lusaka Agreement.

Fighting in the Kivus

24. MONUC is also concerned about reports of fighting in the Kivus, where clashes between armed groups and Rwandan troops, as well as armed attacks on civilians (see para. 25 below) have taken place. Inter-ethnic clashes are rampant throughout most of

North and South Kivu. RCD and their allies, who are nominally responsible for security there, seem unable to prevent killings by the former Rwandan Government forces (ex-Forces Armées Rwandaises (FAR)) and Rwandan and Burundese rebel groups, including the Interahamwe. The local armed group, known as the Mayi Mayi, is also involved in these attacks.

25. On 9 June 2000, a United Nations-led mission to the Haut Plateau area in the vicinity of Fizi-Uvira found that inhabitants there had effectively been under siege since March 2000. Only one route was now considered safe, and then only one day a week in each direction with military escort. The inhabitants have been subjected to repeated attacks by the Mayi Mayi and their Interahamwe and Burundese rebel allies, resulting in the forced displacement of some 35,000 people out of an estimated original population of 80,000. The Interahamwe have also reportedly conducted attacks at Masisi and other parts of North Kivu, resulting in civilian deaths and large-scale displacements. The Interahamwe may also have struck inside Rwanda itself.

Deployment of the Mission

26. The United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo now has a total of 228 military observers and military liaison officers deployed in and around the Democratic Republic of the Congo (see annex), including about 200 within the country, at Kinshasa and 11 other sites (Boende, Bunia, Gbadolite, Gemena, Goma, Isiro, Kananga, Kindu, Kisangani, Lisala and Mbandaka). The remaining 28 officers are stationed in the capitals of surrounding countries (see chart and map attached). MONUC is also examining the possibility of establishing a logistics base in the east of the country, perhaps at Goma, as well as a medical facility there. Much of the equipment required for the second phase of MONUC has already been procured.

27. As has been stressed in earlier reports, the deployment of United Nations troops in the Democratic Republic of the Congo presents particularly acute problems of logistics. The degraded state of the infrastructure in the country, the effective blocking of its inland waterway system by the conflict and the lack of roads make it necessary initially to conduct all deployments and sustainment by air. This fact has placed particular importance on the provision of specialized units to prepare and ensure the security and safety of airstrips in the interior, without which deployment cannot take place. The specialized units concerned include cargo loading and handling, meteorology, airspace management, movement control, water processing, fuel management, air crash rescue and firefighting teams.

28. In response to repeated requests, a few troop-contributing countries have offered to provide the infantry battalions and some of the specialized units required for the deployment of the second phase of MONUC. Currently the most glaring deficiencies are in cargo handling units and air crash and rescue capabilities.

29. Agreement in writing has been reached with troop-contributing countries in respect of three of the four battalions to be deployed in the second phase (Morocco, Pakistan and Senegal). The Secretariat has been in close contact with South Africa to follow up a request to that country to provide an infantry battalion and a number of specialized units.

30. On the basis of the offers received, the Department of Peacekeeping Operations drew up a plan envisaging that the first deployments of specialized units and a protection capability in Kisangani would begin in July. Deployments of the remainder of the battalion in Kisangani and the specialized units and infantry contingents in the other three locations would then follow from late July to October. This plan depended for its timely fulfilment on three conditions: the strict adherence of the parties to the ceasefire, their full cooperation with MONUC in ensuring security and freedom of movement and providing the necessary premises for United Nations facilities, and the readiness of the troop-contributing countries to ensure that the units they had contributed possessed adequate strength, equipment and training. Unfortunately, none of those three conditions has been met.

31. In accordance with normal procedures, the Department of Peacekeeping Operations subjects offers of troops and specialized units to an evaluation to ensure that the contingents concerned possess the necessary equipment and training to discharge their duties. This process has become particularly important in view of recent experiences in Sierra Leone.

32. Department inspections have found serious logistical deficiencies in the units scheduled to be dispatched to the Democratic Republic of the Congo. One country which had undertaken to provide four

airfield crash rescue units subsequently withdrew the offer and proposed only one unit instead. Another, which was supposed to provide an infantry battalion, has none of the 20 armoured personnel carriers required, and lacks significant amounts of other *matériel*, including generators, engineering equipment and radio-equipped jeeps. Some of the required equipment might be supplied by another donor country, but the timing and other details remain unclear. A third potential troop-contributing country, which had committed itself to providing a battalion, has informed the Department that it has no engineering equipment.

33. The first deployment of United Nations formed units was to have been at Kisangani. However, in view of the fighting that has erupted there in recent days, it is not considered possible or prudent at this stage to proceed with the necessary preparations. The fighting around Mbandaka and clashes in Kivu also have to be taken into account in this regard.

34. The restrictions imposed on the Mission's freedom of movement have become a major issue with MLC, RCD and the Government. MLC has blocked the efforts of MONUC to deploy a team to Basankusu in Equateur Province, while RCD has refused permission to MONUC to land at Kongolo airport and to deploy a military observer team in the town. That decision also effectively blocks the stationing of a MONUC team at Kabalo, as had been planned. In Government-controlled territory, MONUC was refused permission to land at Mbandaka even for the purpose of medical evacuation. The Government also refused to allow the deployment of a military observer team to Mbuji Mayi.

35. In spite of its signing of the status-of-forces agreement with MONUC during the visit of the Security Council mission, the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo has also refused the Mission's request to replace the current system of flight authorizations on a case-by-case basis with a system of advance notifications en bloc, a system which will be essential for the management of the large fleet of aircraft envisaged in the second phase. Furthermore, the local civilian and military authorities in the locations proposed for the deployment of MONUC battalions have not yet complied with the Mission's requests for assistance in identifying suitable premises, including the use of areas of Kinshasa airport that would be necessary for deployment.

36. In mid-May, MONUC took steps to secure the release of a team from the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) detained by troops of the Forces armées congolaises in Mbandaka. Although MONUC was assured of the UNHCR team's release, the team was in fact transferred to custody in Kinshasa. The team was not released until 26 May, after my Special Representative had raised the matter with President Kabila.

37. In accordance with the relevant Security Council resolutions, including resolution 1291 (2000), the Department of Peacekeeping Operations has circulated to all peacekeeping missions, including MONUC, information concerning United Nations policies on HIV/AIDS. MONUC has also been asked to advise on measures that could be taken to help stem the spread of the disease. Incoming United Nations military personnel routinely receive instruction in precautions against the spread of HIV/AIDS. At a meeting with the Minister of Health of the Democratic Republic of the Congo on 3 June, my Special Representative proposed that MONUC medical staff, together with World Health Organization personnel, work with the Ministry to develop sensitization programmes and procedures to distribute condoms.

IV. Humanitarian aspects

38. The number of persons in critical need of food in the Democratic Republic of the Congo is estimated at 16 million, or roughly 33 per cent of the country's population. The prolonged conflict and massive uprooting of rural populations has produced similar malnutrition rates among internally displaced, host communities and urban populations alike. There are more than 1.3 million people displaced, partly because of the highly volatile situation in the Kivus. About 5 million persons throughout the country are completely or partially isolated from their traditional supply routes by insecurity or, in the case of Kisangani, by the after-effects of the fighting that broke out there early in May. The same factors have restricted the access of humanitarian workers to populations in need. In May, the International Committee of the Red Cross and Médecins sans frontières were forced for over three weeks to interrupt their support to nutritional centres in Kisangani.

39. In Ituri, despite the progress made in promoting respect for humanitarian principles among the local

authorities, the dispute over land allocation has led armed mercenaries — occasionally helped by foreign forces — to prevent displaced persons from returning to their land. Armed clashes also broke out despite the request for a humanitarian truce to allow students to take their national examinations. Furthermore, part of the population on the right bank of the Tshopo River had to flee their homes when heavy fighting broke out in their vicinity.

40. The towns of Uvira and Fizi in South Kivu have remained inaccessible to UNHCR because of increasing insecurity. There are reports of a refugee influx from the Democratic Republic of the Congo into Burundi.

41. In Equateur Province, the clashes between Government and MLC forces in the northern parts of the province have put Mbandaka under constant threat and restricted the use of the Ubangui and Congo rivers to deliver relief supplies. The fighting has also hampered efforts to deal with a cholera outbreak brought to Mbandaka by barge passengers from Kinshasa. Over 100 cases have been registered since 16 March. Humanitarian personnel from the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, the World Food Programme, MONUC and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations are in the process of establishing a humanitarian office in Mbandaka to help improve access and staff security.

42. At a meeting with my Special Representative on 3 June, the Minister of Health of the Democratic Republic of the Congo drew his attention to the rapid spread of HIV/AIDS in the country, particularly in those parts where foreign troops were stationed. In some towns, infection rates were reportedly estimated to be as high as 90 per cent, with even many schoolchildren infected. The frequent incidence of rape and the absence of condoms contributed to the spread of the disease.

43. MONUC and the humanitarian agencies are continuing to experience difficulties arising from the official Government exchange rate, which effectively magnifies the cost of conducting activities in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. An approach is being made to the Government to secure a more favourable and realistic exchange rate, as was called for in the status-of-forces agreement signed on 4 May.

V. Human rights

44. The human rights situation throughout the Democratic Republic of the Congo continues to give serious cause for concern. Although the Government has announced a moratorium on the carrying out of death sentences, the arrest of Government opponents, trade unionists and journalists continues, and many political prisoners remain in jail. In this connection, the Minister of Information has declared his intention to introduce a law abolishing imprisonment for press offences.

45. Meanwhile, the pace of military executions continues unabated in both Government-controlled territories and rebel-held areas, and there is also no indication when the projected Appeals Chamber of the Military Court will become effective. The continuing executions of Government soldiers appear to confirm reports of a growing number of desertions from the Forces armées congolaises. MONUC has initiated discussions on reform proposals with the judges of the Military Court.

46. Although it is difficult to confirm recent reports by Amnesty International that the human rights situation has recently deteriorated, there is disturbing evidence of the excesses of various State security institutions, which have sweeping powers of arrest and detention, with detainees having little recourse to the law. The prohibition of political activities is still in force despite the provisions in the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement concerning the inter-Congolese dialogue.

47. This further undermines the hopes that were placed in the Democratic Republic of the Congo upon the appointment of a Minister of Human Rights, who it was believed, was going to contribute to the improvement of the human rights situation in the country. It is difficult to reconcile the prevailing situation with the requirements of the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement, which envisages the participation in the national dialogue of various opinion groups, civil organizations and the political opposition.

48. The human rights situation is further aggravated by a justice system controlled at every level by the State, and unable to grant defendants the most elementary procedural guarantees.

49. In the rebel-held areas, recent outbreaks of heavy fighting, especially in Equateur Province, reportedly involve severe human rights violations. According to

several reports from local human rights non-governmental organizations in the eastern region of the country, rebels, the Ugandan and Rwandan armies and non-signatory armed groups engage in regular acts of violence, the systematic use of torture, rape and robbery, the restriction of movement and enforced deportation.

50. The Permanent Representative of the Democratic Republic of the Congo has written to the President of the Security Council (S/2000/453 and 468) to draw his attention to the massacre of civilians in Katogota (South Kivu). This incident has now been confirmed by a team of United Nations investigators, comprising a Human Rights Officer and a Humanitarian Affairs Officer. While there is compelling evidence that the massacre did occur, the investigators could not determine the exact number of victims.

VI. Child protection

51. Recent reports from MONUC military observers appear to indicate that the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the Congolese rebel movements and the armed groups continue to recruit and train children in their armed forces. Though no figures are available, MONUC is aware of accounts that at least one front-line unit may contain a large proportion of boys and girls aged from 12 to 16. These children, though armed, are unpaid and have been accused of taking what they need from the local civilian population by force. Gathering further information about such units will be a major priority of the MONUC child protection staff.

52. The Ministry of Defence has informed UNICEF that President Kabila has yet to sign the decree on the *Coordination nationale de démobilisation et de réinsertion*, which would declare the Government's willingness to demobilize child combatants and refrain from recruiting children into its armed forces. MONUC has strongly urged the Government to sign this instrument, and will seek to engage the other parties to sign similar decrees in turn.

53. The Child Protection Section of MONUC, together with UNICEF, the World Health Organization, UNHCR, the World Food Programme and other agencies and non-governmental organizations, has been developing plans for the implementation of a series of national immunization days. These are to be held from 7 to 9 July; from 11 to 13 August; and from 13 to 15 September throughout the entire territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. It is intended to immunize some 11 million children aged 5 years or under. MONUC is prepared to provide assistance in accordance with its capacities.

54. During the reporting period, the child protection advisers contributed to the conduct of orientation and training seminars for incoming military liaison officers on issues relating to war-affected children.

VII. Inter-Congolese dialogue

55. On 25 April, the neutral facilitator of the inter-Congolese dialogue, Sir Ketumile Masire, briefed the Security Council on the approach he intended to follow in carrying out his mandate. He presented a broad outline of his work plan, consisting of three phases. During the preliminary consultative phase, which ended in April, the facilitator had contacted all Congolese parties and groups expected to participate in the dialogue. During the second phase (May-June), the Congolese parties would seek to reach agreement on crucial issues such as the venue, draft agenda, level and type of participation, rules of procedure and structure of the dialogue. The inter-Congolese dialogue itself would constitute the third phase. It is scheduled to commence no later than 3 July and to last 45 days.

56. Following his visit to New York, the facilitator travelled to Kinshasa on 11 May, where he met with President Kabila and with representatives of the unarmed opposition and civil society. He also met with the leaders of RCD at Goma, RCD-ML at Bunia and MLC at Gbadolite before returning to Kinshasa on 21 May. In part the facilitator's discussion with the Congolese parties and groups concerned the planning of the preparatory meeting to be held at Cotonou to finalize arrangements for the inter-Congolese dialogue. Before his departure, the facilitator invited the Congolese parties and groups concerned to attend the Cotonou meeting on 5 and 6 June.

57. The facilitator left Kinshasa on 24 May without seeing President Kabila, but met instead on 23 May with the Minister for Foreign Affairs.

58. The Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, which had been critical of the facilitator's work plan, did not attend the Cotonou meeting. Furthermore, on 5 June government officials prevented

representatives of civil society and the unarmed opposition from departing from Kinshasa to attend the meeting.

59. On 6 June, representatives of MLC, RCD, the unarmed opposition and the *forces vives* from rebel-controlled territory issued a statement at Cotonou deploring the absence of the Government and the Government's refusal to allow other participants from Kinshasa to take part. The statement called for the convening of a second preparatory meeting on 3 July at Gaborone under the chairmanship of Sir Ketumile Masire.

60. MONUC has taken steps to place the expertise of its staff at the disposal of the facilitator, including the provision of both financial and political advice. In consultation with the facilitator, the Secretariat has made arrangements for a senior adviser, Albert Tévoédéjre, to travel with him during some of his consultations and to assist him on an ad hoc basis in the organization of the preparatory meeting in Cotonou. MONUC has also agreed to provide air transportation for the facilitator, and to help arrange such transportation from other sources, subject to eventual reimbursement from the trust fund. MONUC also offered the use of an aircraft to transport members of political parties and civil society from Kinshasa to Cotonou after the Government prevented them from travelling.

61. However, notwithstanding this support, pending resolution of the problem of the assured longer-term financing of the facilitator's activities, funding shortages persist. Notwithstanding the recent provision of some $0.3 million from the Trust Fund for the Support of the Peace Process in the Democratic Republic of the Congo to cover air transportation costs, the facilitator's current operations are being funded by the Government of Botswana on a temporary basis, on the understanding that they will eventually be reimbursed from donor contributions. At a meeting he held with donor countries in Kinshasa during his recent visit, the facilitator raised doubts as to how long he could continue to operate without the necessary funding. It is understood that, at his request, some donor Governments have agreed to consider depositing funds directly into a fund established for the facilitator's use in Gaborone.

62. On 9 June, the Information Minister of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Didier Mumengi, issued a statement describing the fighting in Kisangani as genocide against the Congolese people. The statement criticized the neutral facilitator for remaining silent in the face of this fighting and announced that the Government was withdrawing its confidence in Sir Ketumile Masire. The statement called on the Organization of African Unity to propose a new neutral facilitator.

VIII. Financial aspects

63. As indicated in my second report to the Security Council on MONUC (S/2000/330, para. 72), the General Assembly, by its resolution 54/260 of 7 April 2000, granted me commitment authority, with assessment, in the amount of $200 million to cover the Mission's immediate requirements and to enable it to initiate logistical preparations for the phase II deployment as mandated by the Council. I have subsequently informed the General Assembly that some $58.7 million of this amount is expected to be committed for MONUC during the period ending 30 June 2000 and have requested its authorization to use the remaining $141.3 million during the period beginning 1 July 2000, pending submission to the Assembly at its fifty-fifth session of my comprehensive budget proposal for the Mission. The Assembly action on my request is expected shortly.

64. As at 31 May 2000, unpaid assessed contributions to the MONUC special account amounted to $169.9 million. The total outstanding assessed contributions for all peacekeeping operations at that date amounted to $2,010.3 million.

IX. Observations and conclusions

65. The situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and the prospects for further progress in the peace process, have become particularly uncertain. Fighting around Mbandaka in Equateur Province, fresh clashes in Kisangani and fighting in the Kivus have cast into doubt the implementation of the ceasefire agreement signed at Kampala on 8 April despite widespread adherence to that agreement elsewhere in the country.

66. The Government's decision not to participate in the preparatory meeting for the inter-Congolese dialogue, its attempts to block the participation of the

unarmed opposition in Kinshasa and the chronic shortages and delays in the provision of resources for the facilitator's operations raise serious doubts concerning the future course of the dialogue. This is especially unfortunate in view of the close relationship that exists between the success of the inter-Congolese dialogue and progress in the peace process generally, including the implementation of the military aspects of the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement. These difficulties have been compounded by the Government's announcement, on 9 June, of its withdrawal of confidence in Mr. Masire and its request to the Organization of African Unity to nominate a new neutral facilitator.

67. Notwithstanding these developments, I express my appreciation to those donor Governments that have already disbursed their pledges to the facilitator and to those that are actively considering making disbursements, whether bilaterally, to the United Nations trust fund, or directly to the special account established in Gaborone for this purpose. I take this opportunity to restate my full support for the activities of the facilitator and my earnest hopes for the success of the inter-Congolese dialogue.

68. The people of the Democratic Republic of the Congo desire peace. The Government, the rebel groups and the Governments of the belligerent countries must demonstrate that they also desire it. Their repeated undertakings to cooperate with MONUC are not always supported by action. The denial of full freedom of movement to MONUC and the deeply regrettable outbreaks of violence in demonstrations outside MONUC headquarters in Kinshasa cast further doubt on the Government's attitude towards the deployment of United Nations peacekeeping troops. I reiterate in this connection the responsibility of the Government to ensure the security of United Nations personnel in the territory it controls.

69. Furthermore, the continued outbreaks of fighting in violation of the ceasefire and the difficulties experienced in the inter-Congolese dialogue augur ill for the timely deployment of the second phase of MONUC. Nevertheless, the Secretariat will continue its preparations for deployment in the hope that conditions will soon permit it. I will keep the Security Council informed accordingly.

70. Deployment is also subject to delays arising from the difficulties faced by the troop-contributing countries that had undertaken to provide battalions and other units. Many of the contingents concerned lack essential equipment, without which it would be irresponsible to deploy them. For all these reasons, and in view of the recent experiences in Sierra Leone, I have ordered a full review and reassessment of the troop levels and other requirements before deployment takes place.

71. Much as the signing of the status-of-forces agreement between the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and MONUC during the visit of the Security Council mission in May is to be welcomed, it has failed to result in full freedom of movement for MONUC operations. The denial of flight clearances for medical evacuations, as occurred on 30 May, is particularly objectionable. Regrettably, MONUC has also faced the denial of its freedom of movement from MLC and RCD in recent weeks.

72. The fighting around Mbandaka, which represents a clear breach both of the Lusaka Agreement and the Kampala disengagement plan of 8 April, is also a serious setback to the peace process. I call on MLC and the Government to work with my Special Representative in restoring the ceasefire in Equateur Province without delay. As long as the fighting and uncertainty there persist, the deployment of MONUC phase II elements cannot proceed.

73. The renewed outbreaks of fighting in Kisangani between the Rwandan and Ugandan armed forces are a cause of profound disquiet. The civilian population of Kisangani has already suffered grievously in the crossfire between the two foreign forces that are fighting each other on Congolese territory. I deeply deplore the renewed outbreaks of fighting there and the consequent loss of civilian life and damage to property.

74. The city of Kisangani and its people are in urgent need of large-scale humanitarian assistance. As soon as the fighting has stopped and basic security conditions have been restored, the international community should consider launching a major effort to provide food, shelter and health care, as well as large-scale reconstruction and rehabilitation operations to help repair the damage wrought during the past few days and weeks. It may also be necessary to consider some form of assistance with the civil administration.

75. These emergency humanitarian operations should be regarded as quite separate from MONUC. The Council may wish to consider, perhaps on the basis of a

subsequent report, how the United Nations system and donor countries, in cooperation with MONUC, can assist in this effort.

76. The people of the Democratic Republic of the Congo deserve relief from the persistent violations of their human rights to which too many of them have been subjected. In many cases, these can be attributed directly or indirectly to the conflict in that country. I am shocked and saddened by the reports received of executions, torture, rape, robbery, the destruction of property and illegal detentions carried out in various parts of the country. The widespread hunger and displacement afflicting entire populations throughout the country are also a cause of dismay.

77. Only once all the signatories of the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement have demonstrated genuine commitment to its terms and determination to fulfil the obligations they assumed therein can the United Nations hope to succeed in assisting them to do so. The way will then be open for the deployment of the second phase of MONUC, provided that the necessary facilities are made available, and the military units concerned are fully equipped and prepared to assume their tasks.

78. The meeting of the Political Committee in New York on 15 and 16 June, at the invitation of the President of the Security Council, is a welcome chance for all the parties to undertake a serious re-evaluation of the deteriorating situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. It is also an opportunity for the members of the Security Council to make it clear to the parties that their assurances of support for the peace process and guarantees of security and freedom of movement can no longer be taken at face value, but must be reflected in their actions.

79. I invite the Security Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, to demand that the Governments of Rwanda and Uganda order their respective armed forces to desist forthwith from further fighting and withdraw from Kisangani immediately and from the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo promptly thereafter. Those two forces should be held accountable for the loss of life and the property damage they have inflicted on the civilian population of Kisangani.

80. I urge the Council, also acting under Chapter VII of the Charter, to demand the subsequent early withdrawal of all other foreign forces in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, as foreseen in the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement. The war there has already led to far too much death, destruction, hunger, human rights violations and population displacement. It must end now.

81. I wish to express my appreciation to my Special Representative, to the Force Commander, and to the military and civilian personnel of MONUC and other United Nations personnel operating in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, in particular those who have been deployed to Kisangani. Their contribution to the cause of peace in that country is being made under particularly trying and difficult circumstances.

Annex

United Nations Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo: contributions as at 5 June 2000

	Military observers	*Staff officers*	*Total*
Algeria	6	1	7
Bangladesh	8	7	15
Benin	6	2	8
Bolivia	2		2
Burkina Faso	2		2
Canada		1	1
Czech Republic	3	1	4
Denmark		1	1
Egypt	11		11
France	2	1	3
Ghana	8		8
India	8	3	11
Jordan	2		2
Kenya		2	2
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	3		3
Malaysia	3	7	10
Mali	2		2
Nepal	9		9
Niger	2		2
Pakistan	12	16	28
Peru	3		3
Poland	1	1	2
Romania	11	1	12
Russian Federation	5		5
Senegal	13	10	23
South Africa	1		1
Sweden	2		2
Tunisia	6		6
Ukraine	2		2
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	1	5	6
United Republic of Tanzania	6	1	7
Uruguay	12	7	19
Zambia	9		9
Total	**161**	**67**	**228**

Map No. 4121 Rev. 3 UNITED NATIONS
June 2000

Department of Public Information
Cartographic Section

United Nations S/2000/567

Security Council

Distr.: General
13 June 2000
English
Original: Arabic

Identical letters dated 8 June 2000 from the Permanent Representative of Iraq to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General and to the President of the Security Council

On instructions from my Government, I have the honour to inform you of an incident that took place at 0900 hours on 24 May 2000. A group of Iraqi fishermen on the boat *Zaman* (No. 1442/Basrah) were fishing inside Iraqi territorial waters in the Khawr Abd Allah area when two grey Kuwaiti naval craft flying the Kuwaiti flag, each with two enlisted men on board armed with automatic weapons, fired on the boat in an indiscriminate manner and hit its fuel tank. One of the enlisted men boarded the fishing boat and ordered the fishermen to assemble in the bow. He then searched it and threw the fish and the gas cylinders on board into the sea. They struck the fishermen and abused them verbally, alleging that the boat was inside Kuwaiti territorial waters. The fishermen were detained for more than 15 minutes, after which time the boat's papers and their identification documents were confiscated.

The action of the Kuwaiti authorities in entering our territorial waters to assault Iraqi fishermen there is a manifest breach of Iraq's sovereignty and integrity and an act of armed aggression that, by the most elementary standards governing relations between States, constitutes a flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations and of all the principles of international law and prevailing international conventions that reject the threat or use of force against the integrity and independence of any country. We protest against the hostile conduct of the Kuwaiti authorities, and we urge you to intervene in order to prevent these violations, namely entry into Iraq's territorial waters and the perpetration of such acts of provocation. The Government of the Republic of Iraq reserves in full the inalienable right accorded to it by the Charter of the United Nations, the principles of international law and international conventions to take whatever measures are necessary to defend its sovereignty and territorial integrity and, in accordance with the principle of international responsibility, to seek compensation for the material and other damage done to it by these acts of aggression.

I should be grateful if you would have the present letter circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Saeed H. **Hasan**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

00-47736 (E) 140600 140600

United Nations S/2000/568

Security Council

Distr.: General
13 June 2000

Original: English

Letter dated 13 June 2000 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Ethiopia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

I have the honour to transmit herewith resolution No. 2/2000 of the Council of the Peoples' Representatives of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia on the deplorable atrocities being committed against Ethiopian civilians in Eritrea, issued on 13 June 2000.

I should be grateful if you would have the present letter and its annex circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Fesseha A. **Tessema**
Chargé d'affaires a.i.

00-47743 (E) 140600

Annex to the letter dated 13 June 2000 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Ethiopia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

Resolution No. 2/2000 of the Council of the Peoples' Representatives of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia on the deplorable atrocities being committed against Ethiopian civilians in Eritrea

The Council of the Peoples' Representatives of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia:

Guided by the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, other international human rights instruments and international humanitarian law principles;

Noting that all Member States of the United Nations have an obligation to promote and protect human rights and fundamental freedoms and to fulfil the obligations they have freely undertaken under the various international human rights instruments;

Mindful that Eritrea, as a party to the United Nations Organization, has an obligation to promote and protect human rights and fundamental freedoms, as stated in the United Nations Charter and elaborated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights;

Gravely concerned by the attacks against Ethiopian civilians and serious crimes and abuses committed by the Eritrean military police, the army and security personnel, as well as government-incited mob actions against Ethiopian nationals residing in Eritrea;

Reaffirming that all States have an obligation to abide by the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949 and their two Additional Protocols, as part of customary international law;

Noting with serious concern the fact that Ethiopian civilians remain the central target of the Eritrean regime since day one of its unprovoked aggression against Ethiopia;

Reiterating its concern with regard to the poor conditions of detention and the inhuman treatment of Ethiopian prisoners of war, to whom Eritrea refuses to give access to the International Committee of the Red Cross and other humanitarian agencies;

Deeply concerned about the gross, widespread and flagrant violations of the human rights of Ethiopian civilians by the Eritrean regime in its newly created concentration and slaughtering camps of Asmara, Sheketi, Maihabar, Massawa and other undisclosed localities;

Alarmed by the recent shocking reports of vindictive killings and indiscriminate attacks of Ethiopian nationals residing in Eritrea by the Eritrean regime;

1. Deplores the inhuman and barbaric acts of killing, torture, rape and similar atrocities being committed against Ethiopian nationals living in Eritrea by the Eritrean regime;

2. Expresses its dismay at the recent merciless manslaughter of Ethiopian nationals in the towns of Asmara, Keren, the village of Adi Gu'adad, Massawa, Adi Nefas and other localities currently being created by the Eritrean regime;

3. Strongly condemns the recent abduction of Ethiopian nationals and their subsequent forceful disappearance, in particular the abduction and forceful disappearance of 1,337 Ethiopians from the town of Keren, 3,000 Ethiopians from the town of Massawa and 20,000 Ethiopians from the town of Assab, the recent abduction of Ethiopians and their arbitrary detention in open fields, without food, shelter or medical assistance, in particular the abduction of 1,758 Ethiopians from the town of Mendefera and 1,394 Ethiopians from Dekemehari and their subsequent arbitrary detention in Sheketi and Maihabar respectively, and the recent arbitrary detention and inhuman treatment of thousands of Ethiopian nationals in prisons in Asmara and concentration camps in different localities;

4. Also condemns the widespread practices of violations and abuses of human rights and humanitarian law by the Eritrean regime, including the right to life, liberty and security of person and freedom from torture and other forms of cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment or punishment of Ethiopian nationals throughout that country;

5. Urges the Eritrean Government:

- To respect fully all human rights and fundamental freedoms of Ethiopian nationals without any discrimination whatsoever in accordance with international human rights instruments;
- To halt immediately and without any precondition arbitrary detentions, extrajudicial and summary executions, disappearances and deportations of Ethiopian nationals;
- To respect fully international humanitarian laws, to protect civilians, to refrain from the wanton destruction and looting of Ethiopian civilian properties and to stop conscripting or enlisting Ethiopian nationals into its army of aggression;
- To ensure the immediate and unconditional release of civilian Ethiopian detainees in different concentration and killing camps;
- To disclose fully and immediately the whereabouts of Ethiopian nationals abducted from different towns and localities of Eritrea;
- To allow immediate and unconditional access to the International Committee of the Red Cross and other human rights and humanitarian agencies to all Ethiopian civilian detainees and prisoners of war;

6. Calls upon the Secretary-General of the United Nations, the Secretary-General of the Organization of African Unity, the African, Caribbean and Pacific Group/European Union Joint Assembly Human Rights Committee, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, the United Nations Human Rights Commission and the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights to appoint an independent body without delay to investigate fully reports of mass killings,

slaughter, disappearances and cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment of Ethiopian civilians at Asmara, Keren, Adi Guadad, Adi Nefas, Durfo and other concentration camps currently being created by the Eritrean regime;

7. Urges the international community to put pressure upon the Eritrean regime for the full and immediate disclosure of the whereabouts of Ethiopian nationals abducted from the Eritrean towns of Keren, Massawa, Assab and Asmara, as well as from different localities in that country;

8. Calls upon the international community to put pressure upon the Eritrean regime for the immediate and unconditional access by the International Committee of the Red Cross and other human rights and humanitarian agencies to all Ethiopian civilian detainees and prisoners of war, including the concentration camps of Massawa, Sheketi, Maihabar and Asmara;

9. Urges the international community to put pressure upon the Eritrean regime to ensure the immediate and unconditional release of civilian Ethiopian detainees in different concentration and killing camps of Eritrea;

10. Further calls upon the international community to take effective measures to halt the grave violations and abuses of human rights and violations of international humanitarian law by the Eritrean regime, and to bring to justice the perpetrators of these crimes;

11. Calls upon the international community to put pressure upon the Eritrean regime for the humane treatment of all Ethiopian civilian detainees, including provision of adequate medical treatment, food and water, as well as for the immediate and unconditional transfer of all detainees into sheltered places from the open desert and rocky concentration camps.

United Nations S/2000/569

Security Council

Distr.: General
14 June 2000
English
Original: Arabic

Identical letters dated 13 June 2000 from the Permanent Representative of Kuwait to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General and to the President of the Security Council

On instructions from my Government, I have the honour to inform you that, on the morning of 9 May 2000, the Kuwaiti security authorities apprehended two infiltrators across the western border from Iraqi territory who proved to be Iraqi citizens named Matar Radi Udwah Dahash and Haydar Ali Abbas Majham.

After their interrogation by the competent authorities, they confessed to the following:

1. That they belonged to the Nasiriyah branch of the Iraqi intelligence services under the command of their officer-in-charge, who is called Captain Sinan and nicknamed Abu Hukm.

2. That they took part in the activities of the so-called League of Rightful Claimants. Established and funded by the Iraqi authorities, its activities are run by the Nasiriyah branch of the Iraqi intelligence services.

3. That they brought narcotic drugs and hallucinogenic tablets into the State of Kuwait and marketed them for the Iraqi intelligence services.

4. That they brought in leaflets published by the Iraqi intelligence services for circulation in the State of Kuwait.

5. That they gathered information on the State of Kuwait and endeavoured to spread rumours there.

On another note, the two suspects also stated that the Iraqi authorities were endeavouring to produce a political play entitled "The Slide", aimed against the State of Kuwait.

This incident indicates once again the ill intentions of the Iraqi Government towards the Government of Kuwait and shows clearly that the Iraqi authorities continue to bear malice and are doing their utmost to undermine the security and stability of Kuwait.

We protest against such hostile practices and policies, which are incompatible with the Charter of the United Nations and the relevant Security Council resolutions, in particular resolutions 687 (1991) and 949 (1994). We also request the Security Council and you yourself to intervene with the Iraqi Government to make it desist

00-48005 (E) 150600 150600

from its improper schemes and ill intentions and respect the sovereignty, security and stability of the State of Kuwait.

I should be grateful if you would have this letter circulated to the members of the Security Council as a document of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Mohammad A. **Abulhasan**
Permanent Representative

United Nations S/2000/570

Security Council

Distr.: General
14 June 2000
English
Original: Arabic

Identical letters dated 11 June 2000 from the Permanent Representative of Iraq to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General and to the President of the Security Council

On instructions from my Government, I have the honour to transmit to you herewith a letter dated 8 June 2000 from Mr. Mohammed Said Al-Sahaf, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Iraq, concerning an assault on an Iraqi fishing boat in Iraqi territorial waters by a patrol of the Kuwaiti regime on 2 June 2000.

I should be grateful if you would have the present letter and its annex circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Saeed H. **Hasan**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

00-48017 (E) 140600 140600

Annex to the identical letters dated 11 June 2000 from the Permanent Representative of Iraq to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General and to the President of the Security Council

I wish to inform you that at 1500 hours on 2 June 2000 the Iraqi boat *Fatimah* (No. 230) was attacked by a patrol of the Kuwaiti regime consisting of one naval craft with five soldiers on board armed with carbines and side arms and with a PKC machine-gun. They struck the 12 members of the crew with a length of cable and, for no reason, ordered the master, Mr. Abd al-Mahdi Shuhayb Ahmad, to lower the Iraqi flag. When the master and the crew members refused to obey the order of the Kuwaiti regime's patrol, the soldiers fired shots at them, breaking the cabin windows. They confiscated the boat's papers and the crew's fishing permits before leaving for Kuwaiti territorial waters. The fishing boat had been operating inside Iraqi territorial waters in the area of buoy 13 in the Khawr Abd Allah waterway.

The action of the Kuwaiti authorities in entering our territorial waters to assault Iraqi fishermen there is a manifest breach of Iraq's sovereignty and an act of armed aggression that, by the most elementary standards governing relations between States, constitutes a flagrant violation of the Charter of the United Nations and of all the principles of international law and prevailing international conventions that reject the threat or use of force against the integrity and independence of any country. We protest against the hostile conduct of the Kuwaiti authorities, and we urge you to intervene in order to prevent these violations, namely entry into Iraq's territorial waters and the perpetration of such acts of provocation. The Government of the Republic of Iraq reserves in full the inalienable right accorded to it by the Charter of the United Nations and international conventions to take whatever measures are necessary to defend its sovereignty and territorial integrity and, in accordance with the principle of international responsibility, to seek compensation for the material and other damage done to it by these acts of aggression.

(*Signed*) Mohammed Said **Al-Sahaf**
Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Iraq

United Nations S/2000/571

Security Council

Distr.: General
14 June 2000
English
Original: Arabic

Identical letters dated 12 June 2000 from the Permanent Representative of Iraq to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General and to the President of the Security Council

On instructions from my Government, I have the honour to transmit to you herewith a letter dated 11 June 2000 from Mr. Mohammed Said Al-Sahaf, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iraq. The Minister calls attention to the ongoing wanton aggression by United States and British aircraft in the unlawful no-flight zones and to the fact that in the period from 1 to 8 June 2000 they carried out 242 sorties, 82 of them from Saudi Arabia, 48 from Kuwait and 112 from Turkey. He goes on to call for your intervention with the governments of the countries in question with a view to inducing them to halt their aggression and to respect the norms of international law and the sovereignty of Iraq.

I should be grateful if you would have the present letter and its annex circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Saeed H. **Hasan**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

00-48146 (E) 150600 160600

Annex to the identical letters dated 12 June 2000 from the Permanent Representative of Iraq to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General and to the President of the Security Council

I should like to inform you that United States and British warplanes based in Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and Turkey have continued to violate the airspace of the Republic of Iraq. They carried out 242 sorties in the period from 1 to 8 June 2000, 82 of them from Saudi Arabia, 48 from Kuwait and 112 from Turkey, as shown hereunder.

1. In the northern region 112 sorties were flown at speeds of 720 to 780 kilometres per hour and at altitudes of 6,000 to 12,000 metres, as follows:

(a) At 1015 hours on 1 June 2000, United States and British F-14, F-15, F-16, Tornado and EA-6B aircraft coming from Turkish territory penetrated Iraq's airspace in the northern region. They carried out 18 missions from Turkish territory, were supported by an AWACS command and control aircraft operating inside Turkish airspace and overflew the Dohuk, Amadiyah, Tall Afar, Mosul, Zakho, Ayn Zalah, Rawanduz, Baibo, Aqrah, Dukan, Qal'at Dizah and Sinjar areas. They released seven heat flares in the Fayidah, Badriyah and Saddam dam areas north of Mosul city. Our air defences, acting in self-defence, engaged the aircraft and, at 1315 hours, drove them off.

(b) At 1035 hours on 4 June 2000, United States and British F-14, F-15, F-16, Tornado and EA-6B aircraft coming from Turkish territory penetrated Iraq's airspace in the northern region. They carried out 18 missions from Turkish territory, were supported by an AWACS command and control aircraft operating inside Turkish airspace and overflew the Dohuk, Amadiyah, Tall Afar, Mosul, Zakho, Rawanduz and Irbil areas. Our air defences, acting in self-defence, engaged the aircraft and, at 1330 hours, drove them off.

(c) At 1017 hours on 5 June 2000, United States and British F-14, F-15, F-16, Tornado and EA-6B aircraft coming from Turkish territory penetrated Iraq's airspace in the northern region. They carried out 18 missions from Turkish territory, were supported by an AWACS command and control aircraft operating inside Turkish airspace and overflew the Dohuk, Amadiyah, Tall Afar, Mosul, Zakho and Irbil areas. Our air defences, acting in self-defence, engaged the aircraft and, at 1320 hours, drove them off.

(d) At 1000 hours on 6 June 2000, United States and British F-14, F-15, F-16, Tornado and EA-6B aircraft coming from Turkish territory penetrated Iraq's airspace in the northern region. They carried out 18 missions from Turkish territory, were supported by an AWACS command and control aircraft operating inside Turkish airspace and overflew the Dohuk, Amadiyah, Tall Afar, Mosul, Zakho, Ayn Zalah, Baibo and Aqrah areas. Our air defences, acting in self-defence, engaged the aircraft and, at 1310 hours, drove them off.

(e) At 1130 hours on 7 June 2000, United States and British F-14, F-15, Tornado and EA-6B aircraft coming from Turkish territory penetrated Iraq's airspace in the northern region. They carried out 20 missions from Turkish territory, were supported by an AWACS command and control aircraft operating inside Turkish airspace and overflew the Dohuk, Amadiyah, Mosul, Zakho, Rawanduz,

Baibo, Aqrah and Irbil areas. Our air defences, acting in self-defence, engaged the aircraft and, at 1405 hours, drove them off.

(f) At 1013 hours on 8 June 2000, United States and British F-14, F-15, Tornado and EA-6B aircraft coming from Turkish territory penetrated Iraq's airspace in the northern region. They carried out 20 missions from Turkish territory, were supported by an AWACS command and control aircraft operating inside Turkish airspace and overflew the Dohuk, Amadiyah, Tall Afar, Mosul, Zakho, Baibo, Ayn Zalah and Aqrah areas. Our air defences, acting in self-defence, engaged the aircraft and, at 1320 hours, drove them off.

2. In the southern region 130 sorties were flown at speeds of 720 to 780 kilometres per hour and at altitudes of 9,000 to 13,000 metres, as follows:

(a) At 0730 hours on 2 June 2000, United States and British F-15, F-16, Tornado and EA-6B aircraft coming from Saudi and Kuwaiti territory penetrated Iraq's airspace in the southern region. They carried out 12 missions, eight of them from Saudi territory with the support of an AWACS command and control aircraft operating inside Saudi airspace and four from Kuwaiti territory with the support of an E-2C aircraft operating inside Kuwaiti airspace. They overflew the Samawah, Nasiriyah, Basrah, Diwaniyah, Najaf and Jalibah areas. Our air defences, acting in self-defence, engaged the aircraft and, at 0845 hours, drove them off.

(b) At 0825 hours on 3 June 2000, United States and British F-15, F-16, Tornado and EA-6B aircraft coming from Saudi and Kuwaiti territory penetrated Iraq's airspace in the southern region. They carried out 14 missions, 10 of them from Saudi territory with the support of an AWACS command and control aircraft operating inside Saudi airspace and four from Kuwaiti territory with the support of an E-2C command and control aircraft operating inside Kuwaiti airspace. They overflew the Samawah, Nasiriyah, Najaf, Basrah, Salman, Diwaniyah, Lasaf, Jalibah, Shinafiyah, Qal'at Sukkar, Taqtaqanah, Nukhayb, Afak, Hayy and Shatrah areas. Our air defences, acting in self-defence, engaged the aircraft and, at 0940 hours, drove them off.

(c) At 0945 hours on 4 June 2000, United States and British F-15, F-16, Tornado and EA-6B aircraft coming from Saudi and Kuwaiti territory penetrated Iraq's airspace in the southern region. They carried out 20 missions, 12 of them from Saudi territory with the support of an AWACS command and control aircraft operating inside Saudi airspace and eight from Kuwaiti territory with the support of an E-2C command and control aircraft operating inside Kuwaiti airspace. They overflew the Samawah, Shinafiyah, Qal'at Salih, Diwaniyah, Nasiriyah, Qurnah, Basrah, Taqtaqanah and Amarah areas. Our air defences, acting in self-defence, engaged the aircraft and, at 1230 hours, drove them off.

(d) At 0725 hours on 5 June 2000, United States and British F-14, F-15, F-16, Tornado and EA-6B aircraft coming from Saudi and Kuwaiti territory penetrated Iraq's airspace in the southern region. They carried out 42 missions, 28 of them from Saudi territory with the support of an AWACS command and control aircraft operating inside Saudi airspace and 14 from Kuwaiti territory with the support of an E-2C command and control aircraft operating inside Kuwaiti airspace. They overflew the Samawah, Diwaniyah, Nasiriyah, Basrah, Salman, Najaf, Rifa'i, Lasaf and Amarah areas. Our air defences, acting in self-defence, engaged the aircraft and, at 0840 hours, drove them off.

(e) At 0925 hours on 6 June 2000, United States and British F-14, F-15, F-16, Tornado and EA-6B aircraft coming from Saudi and Kuwaiti territory penetrated Iraq's airspace in the southern region. They carried out 16 missions, eight of them from Saudi territory with the support of an AWACS command and control aircraft operating inside Saudi airspace and eight from Kuwaiti territory with the support of an E-2C command and control aircraft operating inside Kuwaiti airspace. They overflew the Samawah, Diwaniyah, Nasiriyah, Basrah, Salman, Kut, Taqtaqanah, Nu`maniyah, Razzazah, Karbala' and Amarah areas. Our air defences, acting in self-defence, engaged the aircraft and, at 1035 hours, drove them off.

(f) At 0725 hours on 8 June 2000, United States and British F-14, F-15, F-16, Tornado and EA-6B aircraft coming from Saudi and Kuwaiti territory penetrated Iraq's airspace in the southern region. They carried out 26 missions, 16 of them from Saudi territory with the support of an AWACS command and control aircraft operating inside Saudi airspace and 10 from Kuwaiti territory with the support of an E-2C command and control aircraft operating inside Kuwaiti airspace. They overflew the Samawah, Diwaniyah, Nasiriyah, Basrah, Salman, Rifa`i, Lasaf, Shinafiyah, Qal`at Sukkar, Ashbajah, Qal`at Salih and Artawi areas. Our air defences, acting in self-defence, engaged the aircraft and, at 1300 hours, drove them off.

This aggression illustrates the bellicose attitude being maintained by the United States of America and the United Kingdom against Iraq. Since 1992, it has become a fixed policy aimed at undermining the country's sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity and at the systematic and concerted destruction of Iraqi lives, infrastructure and civilian installations. It is a policy that has been affirmed in successive statements made by United States and British officials defending the measures being taken to enforce the no-flight zones.

The Government of Iraq categorically rejects the two so-called no-flight zones, which were imposed by unilateral decision of the United States of America and the United Kingdom and lack any legal basis. Iraq rejects all the consequences of this illegal decision and, in particular, the flimsy excuses and pretexts used by these countries in an attempt to justify their military aggression against our country.

The logistic support provided by Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and Turkey to the Americans and the British makes these countries key partners in the aggression being committed against Iraq, so that they bear international responsibility for actions that are deleterious to the people of Iraq.

The Government of Iraq, condemning these acts of aggression against Iraqi civilian targets and installations, urges the Security Council to perform the duties assigned to it, as exemplified by the maintenance of international peace and security, by intervening with the governments of the countries in question with a view to inducing them to halt, bring to a definitive end and refrain from any resumption of their constant and unwarranted aggression against an independent, sovereign State.

(*Signed*) Mohammed Said **Al-Sahaf**
Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Iraq

United Nations S/2000/572

Security Council

Distr.: General
14 June 2000
English
Original: Arabic

Letter dated 13 June 2000 from the Permanent Representative of Iraq to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

On instructions from my Government, I have the honour to transmit to you herewith a letter dated 8 June 2000 from Mr. Mohammed Said Al-Sahaf, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iraq. The Minister calls attention to the fact that the United Nations Compensation Commission has deliberately been concealing from Iraq documentation relating to claims, in violation of the proper legal procedures established in international law and by judicial precedent. He urges you to intervene with a view to having the Commission follow the proper legal procedures.

I should be grateful if you would have the present letter and its annex circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Saeed H. **Hasan**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

00-48011 (E) 150600 150600

Letter dated 13 June 2000 from the Permanent Representative of Iraq to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

The Government of Iraq has received from the United Nations Compensation Commission a procedural order dated 2 December 1999 relating to a claim for compensation submitted by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany on behalf of its Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The procedural order gives the panel of commissioners a 12-month period in which to submit its report and recommendations on the claim to the Commission's Governing Council. It is to be noted that the procedural order contains no information or details concerning the nature of the claim, either in terms of any legal and material evidence as to what caused the damage, or in terms of the type and nature of the damage caused or the time at which it occurred, or in terms of the amount of compensation claimed.

The fact that the Government of Iraq was not provided with the documentation relating to the claim in question but was merely furnished with a copy of the procedural order issued by the panel of commissioners prompts us to reiterate the substance of our previous letters, particularly those of 2 February 1999 (S/1999/113, annex), 11 May 1999 (S/1999/570, annex) and 11 December 1999 (S/1999/1243, annex), in which the Government of Iraq asked to be provided with full information relating to claims and not merely summary information that allows no opportunity for a full legal response to be submitted in their regard. This also gives the Government of Iraq reservations with respect to any decision to be made to compensate the said Ministry as long as it is not provided with detailed information on the claim and given the right to state its views on the matter to the panels of commissioners and to the Governing Council in order to defend its rights and the assets of its people.

Allow me, in this connection, to refer to paragraph 3 of article 35 of the "Provisional Rules for Claims Procedure" (S/24363, annex I, enclosure), which states that "such claims" (namely "claims of corporations and other entities and claims of governments and international organizations") "must be supported by documentary and other appropriate evidence sufficient to demonstrate the circumstances and amount of the claimed loss". We therefore reaffirm our right to know the reason Iraq's requests are ignored and such documentation is deliberately withheld from the Government of Iraq.

In raising this matter, the Government of Iraq invokes its inalienable right to be fully informed of issues and claims that concern Iraq in its capacity as the respondent State as well as its right to know the contents of the documents submitted by claimants so that it may be able to respond to them. You perhaps share our view that withholding such information from Iraq opens the way for claimants to say whatever they wish in order to obtain the sums they are claiming.

The Government of Iraq has endeavoured to state its position and to reveal the unfair, unlawful and unprecedented methods adopted by the Commission in its dealings with Iraq, methods that prevent it from being apprised of even the most basic information that would enable it to comment on a claim, form a view thereon and submit any observations it has to make in its regard.

In view of the fact that we have received no replies over the past years, we appeal to you once more, in accordance with your legal responsibilities, to intervene in this matter in order to have the Commission follow the proper legal procedures

established by international law and judicial precedent so as to protect the assets of the Iraqi people from unwarranted dissipation and waste.

(*Signed*) Mohammed Said **Al-Sahaf**
Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Iraq

United Nations S/2000/573

Security Council

Distr.: General
14 June 2000
English
Original: French

Letter dated 12 June 2000 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council

I have the honour to refer to the United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan (UNMOGIP).

Major-General Joszef Bali (Hungary), who had been the Chief Military Observer of UNMOGIP since 4 March 1999, left the mission on 3 March 2000. Following consultations with the parties concerned, it is my intention to appoint Major-General Manuel Saavedra of Uruguay as the next Chief Military Observer of UNMOGIP.

I should be grateful if you would bring this matter to the attention of the members of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Kofi A. **Annan**

00-47975 (E) 140600 140600

United Nations S/2000/574

Security Council

Distr.: General
14 June 2000
English
Original: French

Letter dated 14 June 2000 from the President of the Security Council addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to inform you that your letter dated 12 June 2000 (S/2000/573), in which you announce your intention to appoint Major-General Manuel Saavedra (Uruguay) as Chief Military Observer of the United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan (UNMOGIP), has been brought to the attention of the members of the Security Council, who have taken note of its contents.

(*Signed*) Jean-David **Levitte**
President of the Security Council

00-47981 (E) 140600 140600

United Nations S/2000/575

Security Council

Distr.: General
14 June 2000

Original: English

Second report of the Secretary-General pursuant to paragraph 14 of resolution 1284 (1999)

I. Introduction

1. The present report is submitted pursuant to paragraph 14 of Security Council resolution 1284 (1999), in which the Council requested me to report every six months on the return of all Kuwaiti property, including archives seized by Iraq, as well as to appoint a high-level coordinator for this matter.

2. I submitted the first report pursuant to paragraph 14 of resolution 1284 (1999) on 19 April 2000 (S/2000/347 and Corr.1). It dealt with compliance by Iraq with its obligations regarding the repatriation or return of all Kuwaiti and third country nationals or their remains. Paragraph 2 of the first report referred to the appointment of Ambassador Yuli Vorontsov of the Russian Federation as the high-level Coordinator. The events and documents referred to in paragraphs 3, 4, 5 and 8 of the report are relevant to the question of the return of property.

II. Background

3. The issue of Kuwaiti property was addressed by the Security Council in the aftermath of the Gulf war. In a letter dated 19 March 1991 (S/22361), the President of the Security Council informed the Secretary-General that the members of the Security Council were of the view that the modalities for the return of property from Iraq should be arranged through the Office of the Secretary-General, in consultation with the parties, and that the procedure also had the agreement of Iraq and Kuwait. To that end, the Secretary-General appointed a Coordinator, whose role was to receive, register and submit to Iraq claims presented by Kuwait and to facilitate the return of property which Iraq had declared that it had in its possession and was subsequently ready to return.*

4. In the report of the Secretary-General dated 2 March 1994 (S/1994/243), the Security Council was informed of the arrangements that had been made to carry out the task of the return of property. The report described the role of the Coordinator and referred to records, procedures and other elements of the hand-over operations. It was noted that the Coordinator was assisted by a small group of United Nations staff members, including one who acted as his representative in the field and facilitated the hand-over operations in Iraq and Kuwait. The Coordinator and his staff in the field had enjoyed the goodwill and cooperation of both Iraq and Kuwait. The hand-over operations, which were financed from the escrow account established under provisions of Security Council resolutions 706 (1991) and 778 (1992), were carried out without major complications, although some were time-consuming and presented considerable logistical problems.

5. The above-mentioned report contained a description of items handed over by Iraq to Kuwait. A subsequent report (S/1994/243/Add.1) listed property which the Government of Kuwait claimed had not been returned or which had not been returned intact.

* Mr. J. Richard Foran, Assistant Secretary-General, Office of General Services, Department of Administration and Management, performed these functions between 1991 and 1994. Mr. Raymond Sommereyns, Director, West Asia Division, Department of Political Affairs and, subsequently, Director, Library and Publications Division, Department of Information, served in this capacity from 1994 until the appointment of Ambassador Vorontsov.

00-47677 (E) 140600

6. In his letter dated 27 September 1994 (S/1994/1099), the Permanent Representative of Iraq to the United Nations noted that, upon the completion of the hand-over of a C-130 aircraft, Iraq would have returned "all the Kuwait property in its possession, having nothing else whatever to return". He added that Iraq would "therefore have fulfilled all its obligations under paragraph 2 (d) of resolution 686 (1991) and paragraph 15 of resolution 687 (1991)". However, on 3 October 1994, the Permanent Representative of Kuwait to the United Nations presented "an indicative but far from exhaustive list of the Kuwaiti property that has yet to be returned" (S/1994/1126).

7. In the report of the Secretary-General dated 16 December 1996 (S/1996/1042), it was noted that the Government of Kuwait continued to attach importance to the return of archives belonging to the various government offices. Kuwait was still seeking the return of private and military property. Annexed to the report was a list of the property returned subsequent to the issuance of document S/1994/243, including property returned after Iraq's 1994 declaration that it had no more property to return.

8. The Security Council was briefed by the Secretariat on 5 November 1997 and announced that, in view of lack of expectations of the imminent return of additional property, the field office of the Coordinator had been closed in February 1997. The originals of the hand-over documents are kept in the Department of Political Affairs.

9. It should be noted that, on 3 June 1997 and on 7 December 1998, the Permanent Representative of Iraq reported that Iraqi authorities had found in local markets several small items (namely, a green leather bag, a revolver, a hunting rifle and several different sized dishes with decoration) that contained markings identifying them as belonging to Kuwait. Although Iraq was ready to return these items to Kuwait, hand-over operations could not be arranged owing to the absence of the representative of the Coordinator in the field.

III. Activities with regard to property issues

10. As mentioned in my report of 19 April 2000 (S/2000/347), I discussed with Ambassador Vorontsov his mandate and programme of work at the initial stage of his activities. Among other things, I requested him to make an inventory of the previous efforts regarding the return of the Kuwaiti property and archives. I recommended that the high-level Coordinator be guided by the conclusions of the panel established under the Chairmanship of Ambassador Celso L. N. Amorim of Brazil and that he establish working contacts with the parties concerned.

11. Since his appointment, Ambassador Vorontsov has conducted consultations with Sheikh Sabah Al-Ahmed Al Sabah, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs, and with Sheikh Salem Sabah Al-Salem Al Sabah, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Defence of Kuwait. He has discussed the issue of Kuwaiti property with Mr. Igor Ivanov, the Foreign Minister of the Russian Federation, the members of the Security Council, the Permanent Representative of Kuwait to the United Nations, and the leadership of the League of Arab States and the Organization of the Islamic Conference, as well as other parties concerned. He has noted, in particular, the attention paid to this issue by the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the relevant provisions of the final document adopted by the Cartagena XIII Ministerial Conference of the Non-Aligned Countries. Ambassador Amorim and Ambassador Prakash Shah have also shared their experience with the Coordinator.

12. It will be recalled that in December 1998 Ambassador Prakash Shah, in the context of the comprehensive review, raised the matter of missing Kuwaiti property with Iraqi officials in Baghdad. Referring specifically to the question of missing archives, Mr. Tariq Aziz, Deputy Prime Minister of Iraq, responded that the property issue was not a major one and that, in his view, it could be easily settled in that context.

13. During my recent meeting on 13 April 2000 in Havana, with Mr. Mohammed Said Al-Sahaf, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iraq, I urged Iraq, among other things, to cooperate on the return of Kuwaiti property and archives. My Iraqi interlocutors reconfirmed their Government's position that this issue should be addressed under Security Council resolution 687 (1991).

14. On 17 May 2000, the Coordinator received a letter from the Permanent Mission of the State of Kuwait to the United Nations, which advised him of the type and volume of the archives that belonged to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The Ministry

maintained large archives before the Iraqi invasion. These archives included categorized files containing tens of thousands of communications, among them confidential and regular documents, including agreements concluded between the State of Kuwait and foreign countries, stored in special rooms. In addition to the archives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Offices of the Amiri Diwan, the Prime Minister and different government institutions kept their own archives. The letter noted that, during the occupation of Kuwait, the archives had been loaded onto Iraqi army trucks and carried to Iraq.

15. As for the weapons that have not been yet returned, Kuwait maintains its claim that Iraq is in possession of military equipment seized from Kuwait. For example, while Iraq had 30 M-113 armoured personnel carriers in 1990 and 173 pieces were taken from Kuwait, Iraq currently has 80 pieces of this equipment. The corresponding figures for BMP-2 infantry fighting vehicles are: 35-40; 245; 200. For M-901 TOW vehicles, they are: none; 56; 40. For Hawk and SAM batteries: none; 5; 1. For Mercedes heavy equipment transporters: none; 86; 86. For Sky Guard air defence brigades: none; 5; 5. These items are referred to in documents S/1994/243/Add.1, S/1994/1126 and S/1996/1042 and, most recently, in a letter received by the Coordinator from the Permanent Representative of Kuwait to the United Nations. In that letter, dated 30 May 2000, the Permanent Representative requested Ambassador Vorontsov's assistance "in demanding Iraq to return the military equipment in compliance with the relevant Security Council resolutions" (see annex).

16. Bearing in mind the references to the United Nations Compensation Commission (contained in the Amorim panel's report, Ambassador Vorontsov has recently established contact with the Commission. He is aware that the Panel of Commissioners had reached a preliminary conclusion that there was nothing that the Commission could do for claimants seeking monetary compensation for loss of irreplaceable objects taken by Iraq, since the Commission had been established for purposes of awarding monetary compensation for losses and had no mechanism for requiring or enforcing specific performance.

IV. Observations

17. Having familiarized himself with the available documentation, and on the basis of information provided by his contacts, the high-level Coordinator has come to the following conclusions:

(a) Iraq has returned a substantial quantity of property over a nine-year period of time, with the bulk of the hand-overs occurring between 1991 and 1994. Despite this fact, there remain many items which Iraq is under obligation to return to Kuwait;

(b) It may never be possible to reach a point at which there will be 100 per cent certainty that all items in Iraq's possession have been returned, and thus allowing for a determination that the return has been completed. However, the continuing absence of a credible explanation from Iraq with regard to the missing property, especially archives, military *matériel* and museum items, delays the closure of the property issue;

(c) Kuwait considers essential the return of archives and military equipment, as well as the items from the Islamic and National museums of Kuwait. The Coordinator joins the Amorim panel in encouraging the Government of Iraq to make additional efforts to find Kuwaiti property on its territory and to continue making such property available for return through the Secretariat. Progress could also be achieved by periodic reports by the parties to the high-level Coordinator, who would maintain an updated list of items yet to be returned;

(d) The Coordinator hopes to have a meaningful discussion with members of the appropriate panels of the United Nations Compensation Commission on the issue of Kuwaiti property during his forthcoming visit to Geneva.

18. Ambassador Vorontsov stands ready to travel to Baghdad at the earliest opportunity in order to facilitate the return to Kuwait of items mentioned in paragraph 9 above which, he understands, are available for immediate hand-over. He is also prepared to seek clarification from the Iraqi authorities regarding their position and intentions referred to in paragraphs 12 and 13 above.

19. At present there is no active mechanism in the field similar to the one established in 1992 to enable the return of property. To that end, in order to minimize

costs I would consider asking the Commander of UNIKOM to assign an existing international staff member to help to facilitate the return of property, as in the past.

20. In conclusion, I would like to reiterate that, while the Coordinator's mandate emanates from the provisions of Council resolution 1284 (1999), understanding and goodwill are of critical importance for the success of his mission, which is aimed at facilitating the closure of an issue that has been pending since the end of the Gulf war. I agree with the Coordinator's conclusion that, at least at the initial stage of his efforts, priority should be given to the return by Iraq of the Kuwaiti archives, military equipment and museum items, and I fully support his efforts in that regard.

Annex

List of military equipment not yet returned to Kuwait by Iraq

Item number	*Items/description*	*Quantity*
1	F1 Mirage fighter planes	8
2	BMP personnel carriers	245
3	M1 13 personnel carriers	90
4	Hawk missile battery	1
5	SAM 7 missiles	463
6	SAM 8 missiles	206
7	SAM 8 batteries	5
8	Amon anti-aircraft batteries	5
9	Mercedes tank carriers	86
10	M-901 missile carriers	56
11	TOW anti-tank missiles (developed)	1 950
12	TOW anti-tank missiles (regular)	1 800
13	Russian LUNA FROG missile launching pads	12
14	LUNA FROG missiles	120
15	M84 tanks	6

United Nations S/2000/576

Security Council

Distr.: General
14 June 2000

Original: English

Letter dated 14 June 2000 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Ethiopia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

I have the honour to transmit herewith a statement from the Office of the Prime Minister of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, issued on 14 June 2000 (see annex).

I should be grateful if you would have the present letter and its annex circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Fesseha A. **Tessema**
Chargé d'affaires a.i.

00-47987 (E) 140600

Annex to the letter dated 14 June 2000 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Ethiopia to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

Statement from the Office of the Prime Minister

The Council of Ministers of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia, yesterday, 13 June 2000, discussed in depth the "Proposal for an Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities" as regards the conflict between Ethiopia and Eritrea, prepared by the Organization of African Unity.

During the Council of Ministers' meeting yesterday afternoon, the leader of the Ethiopian delegation to the proximity talks held in Algiers provided explanations on the proposal presented by the OAU.

Upon examining the OAU proposal for the cessation of hostilities, and after having heard the explanations provided by the Minister for Foreign Affairs, the Council of Ministers has accepted and endorsed the proposal, realizing that it complies with the principles and conditions enunciated earlier by Ethiopia. On this basis, the Prime Minister of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia has sent a letter transmitting the decision of the Council of Ministers to the Current Chairman of the Organization of African Unity.

14 June 2000

United Nations A/54/916–S/2000/577

General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.: General
15 June 2000
English
Original: Arabic

General Assembly
Fifty-fourth session
Agenda items 43, 44, 56, 73 and 79

The situation in the Middle East

Question of Palestine

Consequences of the Iraqi occupation of and aggression against Kuwait

Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the region of the Middle East

The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East

Security Council
Fifty-fifth year

Letter dated 13 June 2000 from the Permanent Representative of Saudi Arabia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to transmit to you herewith the text of the press communiqué issued by the Ministerial Council of the Gulf Cooperation Council at its seventy-fifth regular session, held in Jeddah, Saudi Arabia, on 3 June 2000 (see annex).

I should be grateful if you would have this letter and its annex circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under agenda items 43, 44, 56, 73 and 79, and of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Fawzi Bin Abdul Majeed **Shobokshi**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

00-48290 (E) 200600 200600

Annex to the letter dated 13 June 2000 from the Permanent Representative of Saudi Arabia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

Press communiqué issued by the Ministerial Council of the Gulf Cooperation Council at its seventy-fifth session, held in Jeddah, Saudi Arabia, on 3 June 2000

On Saturday, 3 June 2000, the Ministerial Council of the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) held its seventy-fifth regular session in Jeddah, Saudi Arabia, under the chairmanship of His Royal Highness Prince Saud al-Faisal, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Saudi Arabia and Chairman-in-Office of the Ministerial Council. The meeting was attended by:

His Excellency Mr. Rashid Bin Abdullah al-Nuaimi, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the United Arab Emirates;

His Excellency Sheikh Mohammed Bin Mubarak Al Khalifa, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Bahrain;

His Excellency Mr. Yousef Bin Alawi Bin Abdullah, Minister responsible for Foreign Affairs of Oman;

His Excellency Sheikh Hamad Bin Jasim Bin Jabr Al Thani, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Qatar; and

His Excellency Sheikh Sabah Al-Ahmad Al-Jaber Al-Sabah, First deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Kuwait.

His Excellency Sheikh Jamil Ibrahim Al-Hujeilan, GCC Secretary-General, also participated in the meeting.

The Ministerial Council reviewed the results of the meetings held by a number of ministerial committees for the purpose of promoting joint action as well as the developments that had taken place with respect to political issues at the regional, inter-Arab and international levels.

Cooperation

In connection with economic matters, the Council was informed of the results of the fifth Meeting of Ministers for Municipal Affairs and the fifty-second meeting of the Committee on Financial and Economic Cooperation and of the recommendations they had made for the advancement of cooperation in their respective fields.

In the context of the progress made by the GCC States in establishing close economic relations with international economic groupings, the Ministerial Council welcomed the signing in May 2000 of a Declaration of Principles on cooperation between the GCC States and the States members of the European Free Trade Area and expressed the hope that the declaration would mark the beginning of successful cooperation between the two parties.

In the field of matters affecting man and the environment, the Ministerial Council reviewed the results of the meetings held by a number of ministerial committees, namely those concerned with the expansion of cooperation in the areas

of higher education, scientific research, the civil service, health, Red Crescent societies and the protection of the marine environment in member States.

The Ministerial Council was also informed of the results of the meetings held by a number of committees concerned with the promotion of military cooperation between member States, and it expressed satisfaction at the results achieved by the relevant committees in this regard.

Political issues

The Ministerial Council discussed developments in the context of Iraq's compliance with the Security Council resolutions relating to the consequences of its aggression against Kuwait. It noted once again that Iraq was still temporizing and was evading compliance with fundamental aspects of the relevant Security Council resolutions. It again expressed regret that the Iraqi regime was persisting in ignoring resolutions that have the force of international law, in defying the will of the international community and in rejecting inter-Arab and international initiatives for the creation of an acceptable and effective mechanism or schedule, within the framework of cooperation with the United Nations, for the lifting of the international economic embargo being maintained against Iraq and ending the suffering of the Iraqi people. The Council called upon the Iraqi Government to demonstrate its good faith, in both word and deed, to refrain from any act of provocation or aggression against Kuwait and its other neighbours in compliance with Security Council resolution 949 (1994), to desist from carrying out any acts of sabotage through the agency of elements seeking to undermine the security and stability of Kuwait, and to acknowledge that its invasion of Kuwait had been in violation of the relevant pan-Arab and international covenants. The Council once again urged the Government of Iraq to comply expeditiously with Security Council resolution 1284 (1999) and to cooperate with the United Nations Monitoring, Verification and Inspection Commission established thereby and with the other international arrangements for the release of Kuwaiti and Saudi prisoners and hostages and the return of Kuwaiti property.

The Council further welcomed the adoption of Security Council resolution 1293 (2000), by which the allocation for the repair of Iraqi oil installations is increased from $600 million to $1.2 billion.

In the same context, the Ministerial Council again welcomed all resolutions and initiatives that might contribute to mitigating the suffering of the Iraqi people, suffering for whose origin and perpetuation the Iraqi regime must bear full responsibility. The Council expressed the hope that Iraq would without delay take practical and genuine steps to give clear expression to its commitment to the relevant resolutions and to the requirements for security and stability in the region so as to demonstrate its seriousness by responding to the efforts made at the Arab and international levels to mitigate the suffering of the Iraqi people and restore Iraq to its place in the international community.

The Council reaffirmed its well-known and well-established positions with respect to the need to maintain the independence, unity and territorial integrity of Iraq.

The Council heard a presentation from His Excellency Sheikh Hamad Bin Jasim Bin Jabr Al Thani, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Qatar, concerning ideas for

mitigating the human suffering of the Iraqi people. These ideas will be incorporated in a paper to be sent to member States in order to elicit comments and proposals in their regard.

The Ministerial Council reviewed relations with Iran and the efforts being made by the Committee of Three. It recalled the basic principles approved by the Supreme Council and the approach adopted by the GCC States in their relations with Iran, based as they are on the principles of good-neighbourliness, mutual respect, non-interference in the affairs of others, rejection of the threat or use of force, the peaceful settlement of disputes and regard for mutual interests. It also recalled the instructions given by the Supreme Council at its second consultative meeting, held in Muscat on 29 April 2000, that the Ministerial Committee of Three should continue its efforts to devise a mechanism for direct negotiations between the United Arab Emirates and the Islamic Republic of Iran on the dispute concerning the three islands belonging to the United Arab Emirates. The Ministerial Council expressed the hope that the Iranian Government would respond to the worthy purpose for which the Committee had been established.

The Council considered developments in the peace process in the Middle East, and it noted with regret the breakdown in negotiations on the Palestinian-Israeli and Syrian-Israeli tracks, which had again brought the peace process to a situation of deadlock.

In this context, the Council again expressed its conviction that the only explanation for the breakdown in the peace process on all tracks was the maintenance by Israel of unjustifiable positions and its failure to meet the requirements of the process while the Arab side was pursuing its commitment to peace as an irreversible strategic option. The Ministerial Council renewed its demand that influential parties, and in particular the co-sponsors of the peace process, the United States of America and the Russian Federation, as well as the European Union and its member States, should take action and make greater efforts to urge the Israelis to return to the principles endorsed by the Madrid Peace Conference so that legitimate Arab rights could be restored in implementation of the relevant United Nations resolutions, including Security Council resolutions 242 (1967), 338 (1973) and 425 (1978), and the principle of land for peace.

The Ministerial Council reaffirmed its well-established position that a comprehensive and just peace can only be achieved with the attainment by the Palestinian people of all its legitimate rights, including the right of the Palestine refugees to return in accordance with General Assembly resolution 194 (III) and the right to establish an independent State on its national soil with Jerusalem as its capital. The Council reaffirmed its full support for the position adopted by the State of Palestine that rejects any attempts on the part of the Israeli Government to alter the demographic composition or geographical character of the occupied territories and regards such actions as being in violation of the provisions of international law and the relevant United Nations resolutions. It also stressed that a comprehensive peace can only be achieved with a complete Israeli withdrawal from the Syrian Arab Golan to the boundary line as it existed on 4 June 1967.

The Ministerial Council conveyed its sincere congratulations to the President, Government and people of Lebanon on the restoration of the country's sovereignty over its liberated territories and on the evacuation of the Israeli occupation forces from southern Lebanon and the Western Bekaa. It called upon Israel to complete its

withdrawal from all Lebanese territory in accordance with Security Council resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978). The Council stressed that it was essential that the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) should perform the security functions assigned to it in southern Lebanon under resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978) in order to prevent Israel from finding pretexts to hold Lebanon and Syria responsible for any security incidents that might occur and might jeopardize security, peace and stability in the region.

The Ministerial Council looks forward to the forthcoming meeting of the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Damascus Declaration countries, to be held on 5 June 2000 in Egypt, as an important contribution to joint Arab action.

The Ministerial Council gave its full endorsement to the statement adopted at the meeting held in Tadmur (Palmyra), Syrian Arab Republic, on 3 and 4 May 2000 by the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Egypt, Saudi Arabia and the Syrian Arab Republic in support of the performance by UNIFIL of the security functions assigned to it under resolutions 425 (1978) and 426 (1978).

The Council once more called upon the international community to take action to transform the Middle East region, including the Gulf, into a zone free of all weapons of mass destruction, including nuclear weapons. The Council again affirmed that Israel must accede to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and submit all of its nuclear facilities to the International Atomic Energy Agency inspection regime.

The Ministerial Council followed with great concern the conflict between Eritrea and Ethiopia, and it urged them to do all in their power to spare the two countries the calamity of further warfare and killing. The Council hopes that Ethiopia's announcement of a halt to military operations will be helpful in reaching agreement to end the conflict.

United Nations S/2000/578

Security Council

Distr.: General
15 June 2000
English
Original: French

Letter dated 7 June 2000 from the Permanent Representative of Portugal to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to draw to your attention the statement on the Solomon Islands issued on 6 June 2000 by the Presidency of the European Union on behalf of the European Union (see annex).

I should be grateful if you would arrange for the text of this letter and of its annex to be circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) António **Monteiro**
Permanent Representative of Portugal to the United Nations

00-48281 (E) 160600 160600

Annex to the letter dated 7 June 2000 from the Permanent Representative of Portugal to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

[Original: English and French]

Statement on the Solomon Islands issued on 6 June 2000 by the Presidency of the European Union on behalf of the European Union

The European Union condemns the attempt to overthrow the democratically elected Government of the Solomon Islands. It calls for the immediate and safe release of the Prime Minister, Mr. Bartholomew Ulafa'alu, and others held by the Malaitan Eagle Force. It urges strict respect for the democratic norms and procedures of the constitution. It emphasizes that the peace process in the Solomon Islands can be successfully pursued only through peaceful negotiation, not the use of armed force.

The Central and Eastern European Countries associated with the European Union, the associated countries Cyprus, Malta and Turkey, and the European Free Trade Association countries members of the European Economic Area align themselves with this statement.

United Nations S/2000/579

Security Council

Distr.: General
15 June 2000

Original: English

Letter dated 15 June 2000 from the Permanent Representative of Eritrea to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

I have the honour to forward the attached statement of the Government of Eritrea issued today, 15 June 2000, by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the State of Eritrea (see annex).

I should be grateful if you would have the present letter and its annex circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Haile **Menkerios**
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

00-48243 (E) 150600

Annex to the letter dated 15 June 2000 from the Permanent Representative of Eritrea to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

Statement of the Government of Eritrea

The Government of Eritrea strongly deplored Ethiopia's declaration of war against Eritrea in May 1998 and the invasion that it has perpetrated for more than a month now. This war, and its continuation in any form, remain both unnecessary and avoidable with no justification or benefits whatsoever other than the incurring of an enormous loss of life and destruction of property. Who has gained or lost in this war? Which side has emerged victorious and which side was defeated? We shall not rush into conclusions for the sake of public consumption or on the basis of sheer emotions. Time and history will attest the truth and we can wait for that judgement in patience.

The Government of Eritrea has consistently rejected, from the outset, the imposition of a solution through war and force, choosing instead the path of peace and legality. This is illustrated by the positive positions it took, at various junctures, in regard to the Organization of African Unity (OAU) peace proposals. The positive and constructive stance that it took at the proximity talks in Algiers, convened while the war was raging, is another evidence of its position, corroborated by the events and documents of the proceedings of the peace talks. The fact is the Government of Eritrea did not hesitate to accept without equivocation and delay the OAU proposals on ceasefire and the redeployment of troops.

Not only do ceasefire and the redeployment of troops constitute key provisions of the OAU peace documents, but they are also vital for terminating the war and the logic of force which have no justification or meaning. They will also pave the way for the ultimate resolution of the dispute through peaceful and legal means. These are precisely the reasons why Eritrea has been advocating for a cessation of hostilities from the beginning and why it accepted the current OAU proposal promptly and without equivocation.

If the end of war and the redeployment of troops are acceptable as a first step, the OAU agreement must be signed. The enforcement of the provisions of the agreement should also be verified on the ground in the shortest possible time. Both sides must also proceed to implement the subsequent measures of the peace process without prevarication and with the requisite good faith and seriousness.

The Government of Eritrea reaffirms to the Eritrean people and the international community that it will persist in its firm stance regarding a peaceful and legal resolution to the conflict and that it will continue to work constructively, with the necessary patience and precautions, to implement the agreement on ceasefire and redeployment of troops as well as the subsequent components of the OAU peace package.

Asmara
15 June 2000